

Borough of Pine Hill
Meeting
Planning and Zoning Board of Adjustments
February 11, 2021

- Call to order:** **Call to Order by Mr. Hagarty 7:30pm**
- Pledge of the Flag:** **Led by Mr. Hagarty**
- Sunshine Law:** This is a regularly scheduled meeting of the Pine Hill Planning and Zoning Board. This meeting has been duly advertised and is in full compliance with the Sunshine Law.
- Swearing in of New/
Reappointed Members:** **Class IV Member: Joann Jones expires 12/31/24**
Member sworn in by Solicitor; Mr. Sitzler
- Roll Call:** **Present:** Mr. Hagarty, Mr. Waddington, Mr. Ford, Mr. Hagy, Mayor Green, Councilman Robb, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Wakeley
Absent: Mr. James, Mrs. Gilson
Professionals: Solicitor: Mr. Sitzler, Engineer: Mr. Dougherty, Zoning Officer Mrs. Keyek
- There was a quorum**
- Correspondence:** **New Jersey Planner Vol. 81, No. 6 (November-December 2020)**
- Approval of Minutes:** **Mr. Hagarty:** If everyone had a chance to review the meeting minutes from January 14, 2021, I will entertain a motion to approve.
Mr. Ford: Make a motion to approve; seconded by Mr. Waddington
Mr. Hagy abstained all others present "aye" minutes approved
- Application 2021-1:** **Mr. Hagarty:** The first matter before us tonight is application 2021-1 MUNA of South Jersey, Inc. 400 Erial Road, Pine Hill NJ 08021, Block 74 Lots 1, 13, 26, & 57 for an Amended Site Plan.
With the challenges we have please speak up and introduce yourselves

Ms. Kinback: Thank you Chairman. If anyone needs me to speak up let me know. My name is Danielle Kinback from the Law Firm of Bisgaier Hoff and I represent the applicant; MUNA Center of South Jersey Inc. and their application for an amended site plan. The Property is located at 400 Erial Road; Block 74 Lots 1, 13, 26 & 57.

Ms. Kinback continued to give a description of the property and the use of the property that is a permitted use in the zone it was located. She continued with a brief history of the application and work that had been done that was not approved, the stop work order that was issued in March of 2020, and that they came before the Board in October 2020 for an informal review. She then presented that the applicant was ready to move forward after their Engineer met with the Planning Board Engineer and the applicant is ready to comply with the Planning Board Engineer's Review Letter.

Ms. Kinback: Introduced the applicant's engineer "Mr. Jack Gravlin" and the individual "Mohammad Kabir" who could speak for the applicants.

Mr. Sitzler: Swore in Mr. Gravlin and Mr. Kabir.

Mr. Gravlin provided testimony on his qualifications as a New Jersey Certified Engineer and then went over the past meetings with the Board and with Mr. Dougherty on the development of the need for an amended site plan and what was needed by the applicant to correct previous unapproved work on the property. He discussed what our engineer Mr. Dougherty's review letter required to make the application complete.

Mr. Gravlin: The agreement we had with the additional buffer trees, shade trees and solid fence. These items are on the plans tonight for your approval. It is actually in my opinion this results in improved buffer to the residents along 5th Avenue. We indicated on the landscape plan, which is sheet number four, we are proposing a solid fence along the entire property line that buffers the residents along 5th Avenue. Previously on the original approval we agreed to install the same fence along the sideline of the one property. In addition to that we are installing a series of evergreen trees in staggered fashion behind the solid vinyl fence. I think that from an aesthetic viewpoint this really buffers the rear area even though we are not proposing any activity in that area, so I don't think there are any issues regarding that buffer at this point. We also came to an agreement for the necessary improvements on 4th Avenue back on November 3rd. What we had agreed to at that point was at the end of 4th Avenue pavement was to regrade the roadway to force the runoff across the street to our side and to install an energy dissipater for when the water runs off the cart way into the paper street portion of 4th Avenue. I had revised the plans and was about to send them to Hugh for the informal review prior to a submission to the town when I received an email from Mr. Dougherty stating that there was an erosion issue and we needed to meet again to discuss the drainage situation. I immediately called the contractor and had him install silt fence along the frontage of 4th Street to prevent and stop the erosion that was occurring into the cart

way off our site. I met Mr. Dougherty again on December 8th and at that meeting I was told that a drainage system needed to be installed to collect the 4th Avenue runoff and conveyed by piping through the MUNA property and also diverted beyond the rear yard of a neighbor Mr. Seifert on Lot 13 that lives across the street. This drainage system is actually resolving a situation that has existed for years long before MUNA, my client ever took possession of the property. We walked the area beyond the pavement, and it is obvious that the runoff from 4th Street actually goes across to here on Mr. Seifert's property. He has a valid concern no doubt about that, so I designed a drainage system and submitted to my client for review and he approved it and I subsequently sent it to Mr. Dougherty for a formal review. The drainage system is indicated on the plan that is before you tonight for approval. It consists of a street inlet at the end of 4th Avenue pavement, we are also going to reconstruct the end of the roadway so that we eliminate the crown and force all of the water over to our side at the inlet. After the inlet we'll be installing 270 feet of pipe, two additional yard inlets and a drop manhole with an end section and riprap. The discharge point is well beyond the end Mr. Seifert's property. The piping we are proposing to use is a 24-inch diameter, significantly larger than needed to handle the runoff. This is intended to provide additional storage and infiltration to mitigate a portion of the additional runoff volume resulted from the activity in the back. This is a substantial drainage project by any consideration with a drop manhole we will have to bring a crane in order to install it I'm absolutely certain of that. With regards to the runoff I prepared a stormwater report to actually quantify the additional flows resulting from the water disturbance based on a change to the rear surface cover the runoff elevation has gone from 30 which is brush to 39 which is grass just to give the board a sense of the magnitude a paved parking lot would have a coefficient of 98 so we are increasing it from 30 to 39 but it isn't a significant increase. Once you run through all the numbers the total volume of water additional actually running off the site as a result of the clearing and disturbance I calculated that at 3,272 cubic feet; again just to give the Board a sense of the magnitude if you distribute that over an acre roughly 200 by 200 it is less than an inch and this is a calculation based on a 100 year storm event which is about 8 ½ inches of water and behind this point there are many acres of woods so it really isn't a sufficient increase in volume, the actual peak flow also is a minimal increase particularly calculated for a 100 year storm event. The last item of concern was the rear side area, that was my original plan a call for modifications to the existing parking lot they are indicated on the site plan which is sheet 1; existing out there was just a rectangular paved area, no concrete curb, no kind of driveway channelization. People would have simply driven in and parked perpendicular. As a result of discussions during the original approval we can redo that to construct a curb all the way along 4th Avenue frontage and with two driveways. Rather than my original plan I was actually trying to save the congregation as much money as possible. I was called for the replacement of broken curbs, repairs to existing retaining wall and patching the broken pavement. Rather than doing that the contractor is replacing all these improvements, it will end up with a much better product and it will be constructed as indicated on the improved site plan. Unfortunately, we were issued the stop work order otherwise it would never have been an issue. It's a normal process that when you are under construction you have to remove the existing now there has been some concerns

expressed that my existing conditions plan no longer represents an existing condition but, we are in the midst of construction as a result of the stop work order it has been sitting there for a long time now. Your engineer has issued a report asking for some additional items. Myself and my client have gone through that report and we will agree to completely comply with all the requirements in that letter. It will also include replacement of an additional four trees between the congregant and 4th Avenue that were also removed. To the conclusion my client has grievously acknowledge and apologized for the mistakes and they have agreed to every requirement imposed to resolve both the issues they caused as well to bring the long standing drainage issue along the curb of 4th Avenue. I'm hopeful that the Board will approve the amended site plan subject to engineer's remittance in your engineer's report this will allow them to get back to work and complete the front portion, as it stands with the stop work order nothing is being accomplished and the partially completed project is at a standstill, it is an eyesore, neighbors are not happy, the clients not happy. Hopefully I think we have come to a resolution here. Thank you for your consideration and that concludes my presentation and I am glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Dougherty: If I could I have my letter dated February 5th

Mr. Hagarty: Sure

Mr. Dougherty: Mr. Gravlin had mentioned that he has a copy of it as well. As far as completeness that is one of the things that we normally do on a site plan. The applicant did not originally submit drainage calculations with the application, so I had to declare the application incomplete. Since that time the engineer and I have been in communication and I did receive drainage calculations. So, the board can do this as two resolutions or one but, declare the application complete to continue the hearing tonight and then I will go through the other part of it. Or one resolution declaring it complete and act upon the site plan at the same time as well that would be fine. Bill if that would be fine with you.

Mr. Sitzler: I would prefer that the board would deem it complete on a separate motion first.

Mayor Green: I make a motion to deem the application complete; seconded by Mr. Ford.

Mr. Hagarty: Roll Call

ROLL CALL TAKEN ALL PRESENT "AYE" MOTION PASSED

Mr. Dougherty: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary. To continue with my February 5th letter on page 2 application completeness I have II Design Performance Standards. As Mr. Gravlin has indicated we met in the field at least twice, probably three times just to discuss compensation for the additional runoff that was created as a result of the clearing of that wooded area. Because as the engineer had mentioned when you take down trees there is a certain amount of runoff that occurs with trees and

things that are in the way. The water doesn't runoff as fast as if you converted to a grass area or paving and of course paving runs off the most and it increases the runoff. So in order to compensate for that we looked at several different options; one of the options that we agreed upon was that there is drainage coming down 4th Avenue so to compensate for that runoff in addition to their added runoff we are controlling the runoff from 4th Avenue actually infiltrating some by storing the difference of that additional runoff occurred as a result of the clearing. The improvement shown on the plan we did talk about in the field and we thought that they were adequate enough to address the drainage issues that were exasperated by the clearing of the property. One of the things when I looked at the drainage calculations there were a couple of little minor things that I wanted the engineer to include which was the smaller storms. We talked about that 100-year storm, but the lesser storms could also be disproportionately and more intense even though they are smaller. A two-year storm is maybe about 4 inches of rain verses 8 inches, but a 4-inch rain fall could wreak havoc as well. So, the engineer had agreed to provide additional information on smaller storms.

Mr. Gravlin: I did, Mr. Dougherty and I had a discussion this afternoon I would be glad to provide all of the smaller storms as well as extrapolate additional storage that will be needed.

Mr. Dougherty: Infiltration as well, we would prefer to reduce the amount of runoff that is occurring from this property. On curb and sidewalks, the applicant has indicated that he has agreed, we are just actually sort of memorializing some of the improvements. We are looking for the road surface and the curbs along 4th Avenue, the off street parking at the bottom of page 2 there again we are looking for a minimum of pavement thickness so we have a decent size pavement and the applicant has agreed to comply with that. On the top of page three on storm drainage again the applicant has agreed to those comments with regard to additional perforated pipe. We have also asked for an extension of that pipe a little further down the slope, so we don't have an erosion situation and that is a very erodible soil back there. It is kind of steep at the one end, so we want to be very careful on how we place that outfall where that water is going to be flowing in the future. The applicant has agreed to provide those changes.

Mayor Green: You are going to move the outfall according to the plan to Lot 22 is that correct?

Mr. Gravlin: Wherever you would like it to go, Lot 22 is very close

Mayor Green: Yes, where it is at right now it is a right of way on a paper street, so you have to go past that

Mr. Gravlin: I will absolutely bring the entire piping within lot 22

Mr. Dougherty: I'm just asking for some additional details on the riprap, the erosion protection at the bottom. On landscaping that was an issue we had. Landscaping on the 5th Avenue side is great because

we have a fence with additional landscaping and it does compensate for the clearing of the vegetation in the rear there; on the 4th Avenue side we are just looking for the additional trees between the convent on 4th Avenue and the applicant has agreed to that which I have it spelled out in my letter in the middle there on page 3. As far as the plans, they will be revised indicating replanting of the trees and evergreens that were originally to remain along 4th Avenue. The last part of my letter was just general things that I believe that the applicant's engineer would just agree to provide the kind of engineering details to clarify that the fence is continuous length. I think there was some question whether or not that there was a piece that was staggered but, I think it is to be a straight length along that side property.

Mr. Gravlin: It is, what confused you is that we had agreed to put this pipe in or not and the fence in for the woman who had the swimming pool and all the leaves were going into her pool. I had shown it for another 20 feet or so beyond the turn but the new fence I was indicating on this plan is actually along that property line and it isn't as clear. I will make a clearer new plan; it has always been our intention that the fence will be continuous all the way along those rear properties. There are some existing fences out there and we will have to go talk to the neighbors and if they want to keep their fence also we can shift it slightly on our property but it would seem to make sense to simply go 6 inches on our property, own the fence, maintain the fence in perpetuity.

Mr. Dougherty: So now that we explain about ownership the same would go for the drainage pipe that would leave the right of way and that plastic pipe that goes through your property and down to the head bowl would also be maintained by the property owner?

Mr. Gravlin: That is correct, we will make sure that is installed properly. There isn't a whole lot of maintenance on that but, we will assume maintenance in perpetuity on that pipe.

Mayor Green: Per the Ordinance of the Borough it states you will maintain that pipe and the outflow

Mr. Gravlin: Yes

Mayor Green: Just so we understand, that is going to be one of the conditions tonight. So, the Borough will put together an agreement to where whoever the property owner is they will have to maintain it.

Mr. Sitzler: Mr. Gravlin the Borough Attorney will have to prepare a document.

Mayor Green: He will.

Mr. Sitzler: Memorializing that so, I will make it a condition that the applicant agree to a contract prepared by the Borough's attorney, subject to your attorney's review.

Ms. Kinback: Yes, subject to attorney's review and your people.

Mr. Dougherty: If I could that final point of my letter on the bottom of page 3; because we have had some erosion issues out at the site. I'm just requesting that the applicant work with the Camden County Soil Conservation District. I know a permit was filed and I believe that the Camden County Conservation District had been out to the site. So, in working with them one of the things that I focused on was the construction entrance. Just to verify that just to keep trucks from tracking mud and dirt out onto the road. So, working with the Conservation District to make sure that we don't have that tracking out onto 4th Avenue or even onto Erial Road.

Mr. Gravlin: I will do that; I have discussed this a couple of times with Craig McGee. I actually call him periodically to give him updates to let him know that the project is still on going and that we are still resolving our issues with the Borough. Ultimately, he will receive a revised plan and we will complete all of the stabilization out there as it was indicated on the plans. He has been really great throughout the whole process. Craig has been really cooperative, and I will work that issue out with him regarding stabilizing the construction.

Mr. Dougherty: My only other issue would be that the applicant agrees to the conditions in my letter dated February 5th and that those plan changes would then occur, and we would review. If the board takes action this evening it would be conditional upon revising the plans to meet the letter of February 5th. That is all I have Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hagarty: Do any of the board members have any questions for Mr. Dougherty or any follow-up questions for Mr. Gravlin?

Mr. Hagarty: Are there any members of the public here that would like to come forward and speak to the application 2021-1?

Mr. Waddington: Make a motion we open the floor to the public for this applicant, seconded by Councilman Robb.

Mr. Hagarty: All in favor? All "aye"

Mr. Seifert: My name is Art Seifert. I live at 9 West 4th Avenue the property across the Street from where the drainage issue is. I have a few concerns and a few pages I marked up so hopefully you will bear with me for a bit as I go through these things. I received a letter last Wednesday that there was this meeting tonight so I immediately called the following morning to get copies of the plan which the Borough could not provide due to being closed so the attorney for the applicant emailed them to me right away. So, as I reviewed these, right away I noticed quite a few inconstancies on the plan as to what the actual conditions are in the field. Mr. Gravlin did handle some of them here at the meeting

tonight, but I just wanted to be sure it was fully understood what my concerns were as far as the site plan goes. The six space parking area on the site plan no longer exists, my concern is that since the parking lot was removed and I know the idea was to save it, save money and restripe it because basically this is what we got and they were going to try to make it better than it was. At this point now it is wrong, so my recommendation would be not to put it back the way that it was but to put it back according to the site standards of today because it has been removed and now it is just a dirt spot where the parking lot use to be. Based upon todays present design criteria to improve the Borough you can't keep it the way it was. I don't think it is unreasonable since they went there and took it out. There was also a retaining wall along there that was approximately 3 feet and it is shown on this plan to be there and it is also is not there, this sidewalk does not exist, this sidewalk does not exist and this plan shows them all still existing. When they took them out first regrading of the driveway has decreased several feet in elevation so, with the plans of describing restriping of the existing parking lot I don't understand how you restripe an existing parking lot that doesn't exist. I don't understand how you just repave a parking lot when the dirt that use to sit on it is now pushed over the back of the hill 200 feet away. To me it seems like a lot of chances taken without taking consideration of what is going to happen when this is rebuilt. The trees that are shown along here that Mr. Gravlin mentioned are on the existing plan on sheet 4 and there were 4 trees that they say were evergreens, but they were a mixture of trees. They are shown on this plan as existing to remain, but they do not remain because they got torn down last spring. Along with these other two trees that are also shown as existing but their gone. This plan that shows the, it has a little key here shows existing tree to remain; you will see that right above Erial Road, but the tree can't remain if it is not there anymore. Now the Engineer did mention that these 4 would be replaced unfortunately there were 7 that got removed. So, 7 have been removed and you say 4 will be replaced. The site plan does not show it that way it just shows what use to be an 18 and 10 and 18 and 10. The biggest one that was between the convent and facing our house; that was a 30 or 36 inch tree I counted the rings when they cut it down last year it was 180 years old that tree and it was taken out. It was a healthy tree; you can't plant a 36 inch tree it is unfortunate and this plan does not even call for that tree to be replaced. Th other trees, these six back here are not marked as new trees. Now maybe I'm misunderstanding the key on the plan, but my concern is that when this job is finished and these trees are not put back in, good size trees that are given the ability to mature. If they are not put in and this plan is not clear that says they need to be planted and the Planning Board or Engineer is not made to put them in this will continue to be the hazard that it is right now. The wood line use to be right about here it is now all the way back here, it is an absolute mess that's what it is. As far as the storm runoff goes this entire area here has been ripped up all the way back to Erial Road when they took out the parking lot and all of these trees. I don't know what happen to all the topsoil. There isn't much it is mostly red dirt we have been dealing with. The runoff from the street is covered with dirt that goes down into this swale and also goes down over my property. My concern is that the site plan or landscaping/lighting plan shows a very small area of dirt that is supposed to be removed; here it is install existing lawn area to be restored on site plan page 1 basically the end of the convent on 4th Avenue and over to the parking lot. This area here is showing it to be restored but this entire area needs to be restored. Now I'm not saying this was perfect before, we all know this has been in disrepair for many,

many years this of course has made it considerably worse. The silt fence that was put up in December is not installed properly you can put your hand right underneath the silt fence that is supposed to be buried a foot under the ground and back filled so that the idea is that when the dirt runs down and hits the silt fence it doesn't go through. You can actually see under the silt fence so, who ever put that in put it in with some stakes and walked away. Up closer to Erial Road they did shovel and push a little bit of dirt on top of it but down near my house you can actually see where the silt was. The work that has been done has not been done well and the care of the property has been anything but professional. Then when I see these plans that show existing conditions that are not even existing it's troublesome because we have been having to look at it for many years. Like I said it hasn't been perfect even before, but it is a lot worse than what it was. I was here two years ago at the Planning Board and I supported these gentlemen. I supported turning this school into a mosque school and I have no problem with that. What I do have a problem with is neighbors that do not take good care of their property and don't respect their neighbors. This is my place and I have been here in the town since I was a teenager. I purchased the house in 1989 and I am feeling considerably disrespected; I don't really understand just to have let it go. If they do not have the team to reenforce these things it is not going to get reenforced. Just a couple other small items; like I said the attorney does have this and I'm sure you can get a copy of it if you want it. Let us just go thru the each page; I did talk about the silt fence, the proposed trees in the back, it also shows the light existing that is not there but I do see that he has a light on a post on the side of the building. I was concerned about the single area at the end of 4th Avenue; 4th Avenue down it kind of tilts away runs down one end. Of course, that is not normal conditions on a Borough street when you have a lull area on both sides of the street. So, my concern is what are proper calculations done to be sure that the entire grading area would go into that inlet. From Erial Road to down in front of the school it doesn't seem to be a real problem going into that area, but my concern is what going to be able to take up all of that water. Because for years the water was coming down and that was before this got all messed up. It flows across the street and right down along my side steps which it has destroyed the steps and the biggest thing is that it is going through my yard. We had received the newsletter from the Borough last year that there are various Borough roads including but not limited to West 4th Avenue and West 6th Avenue that have a reconstruction plan approved by the Borough at the cost of \$800,000.00. Is this what is happening because it would be unfortunate for these people to put in a system that doesn't agree with the Pine Hill system.

Mayor Green: Mr. Dougherty has been in contact with the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Dougherty: As the Planning Board Engineer, I am coordinating with the Borough Engineer on those improvements. So, the improvements that they are proposing are consistent with what the Borough is looking to do on 4th Avenue.

Mr. Seifert: Is the Borough doing additional work on 4th Avenue? Or is this going to be basically well we were going to do it but now they're going to do it or is it well we were going to do it, so we don't have to pay for it.

Mr. Dougherty: That I am not sure of, but I think that the Borough is doing additional work. Another point is that we did look at that and we are making them put a double inlet at the back of 4th Avenue as opposed to a single one. I know that was one of your questions. Those improvements were also coordinated with the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Seifert: Ok. Again, I think it is unfortunate that the Borough is already approved money for drainage improvements on the street and then the site plan comes in and does. What happens with that? Ordinance 2020-986 the bond for 4th Avenue. I have not seen the plans. I don't know if there are plans but there has been \$800,000.00 allotted to West 4th and West 6th by the Borough.

Mayor Green: Honestly the drainage issue involves West 3rd and West 4th Avenue.

Mr. Seifert: Well West 3rd Avenue I am not even talking about.

Mayor Green: Well that \$800,000.00 involves both of them even though it says West 4th.

Mr. Seifert: Well this says West 4th and West 6th and it doesn't say West 3rd.

Mayor Green: Well with the drainage issue were having with your property on West 3rd is part of this West 4th Avenue issue.

Mr. Seifert: Ok. So lastly my concern is the topography that is shown on the plans with the swale and the double inlet. The problem is that it is not detailed too well, and it is kind of an open spot right here. There is a large berm where the manhole is at the end and this inlet could actually rises up about foot or a foot and a half before it starts flowing. So, if you look at this water is flowing all the way down the street but that is not really the truth. The truth is the water goes down here and it has to go somewhere and hits a stopping point because it is not an actual flow. So, what I request is that they put a swale through here and that helps with draining the water, so it won't come down in steps. Unfortunately, it cuts through here and ends up doing damage on my property as well. If you have a street sheet flow through this area right here at the end of the street it should be ok. Unfortunately, that would mean taking out 4 or 5 more trees. At the dead end of 4th Avenue is where it starts to drop off. So, this really is still a problem and that is why I came down here. Of course, through the years we have always had runoff onto the property, and it has never been properly stabilized. So, if this is not properly maintained there is going to be a problem because we do not have sheet flow running under here and once again well have flow down on private property. You can see that it is not a straight flow down. My request would be to have the silt removed and have that berm be flatten down and have it properly graded. So that if anything is not properly picked up by the inlet would naturally flow down the paper street of West 4th. So those are my statements and concerns. I am happy with the school being used and I have

no problem with behaviors. I do have a concern with the building maintaining the property. The grass has gotten extremely high through the last couple years since they have owned it. I haven't said much but occasionally something has to be brought to their attention. Thank you.

Mr. Hagerty: Thank you for your time. Any questions?

Mr. Dougherty: I do need to address on those issues. I am familiar with the drainage issues. I have been out to the site a couple of times. That berm Mr. Seifert was talking about was there and the swale has been cut at the end of the street both intended to channel the water down. We're looking at some of these drainage improvements to alleviate some of those issues. Because we are asking for a curve at the end of the debris to curve off the end of 4th Avenue so that there will be at least a six-inch rise in elevation before the water goes over and down into that area below. We're catching the majority of the runoff before it goes down that open area. As far as the existing features that had been removed and are showing up on the plan; we did pull that out and Mr. Gravin had agreed to basically replace what had been taken out before. On the bottom of page 2 of my letter I have indicated that those improvements that were previously shown or previously agreed to had been removed. Their showing here as being existing or being replaced but were basically removed because they were all taken out. So, we did address that issue. The other one was location of existing trees and that same issue the planting will be revised to indicate that the replanting of the trees are to remain with the original application. I am not sure Mr. Seifert if you had a copy of our letter dated February 5th. But some of your concerns were raised and forwarded in our letter.

Mr. Seifert: Ok. And again, I realize that this is not the applicant's problem but maybe I'm wrong. Through the years there was always a turn around when you got to the end of the street; it's a dead end and there had always been cars parked there. When the kids had school and the teachers were parking there it was always a problem at the end of the street. With curb on both sides and properly landscaped with grass on both areas there will be absolutely no way that you can turn around safely at the end of the street. And I know when there are services for the new owner and the building is filled up there will be cars all the way down to the street. I am not sure what can be done about that but there is no safe way to turn around. Of course right now there is no place for parking and that is a silt fence there but when the snow plows they just plow that whole thing in so that is going to be a problem in the winter time with snow like we have now.

Mr. Hagerty: Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Seifert? Just in terms of what he said. Anything that anybody would like to ask or any clarifications.

Mr. Seifert: My concern is like I said earlier if it is not clearly shown in the plan, we will not be accused to say that we have a grievance. Because if it happened with me and I had an approved plan and it did not say specifically had to do these things and I did not do them; you came to me and said to do them I

would say no I don't. I would like that to be looked at a little more carefully in making sure that these things are enforced specifically in part of the approval. Because once it is done it is done.

Mr. Hagarty: Mr. Seifert I can assure you that the purpose of what we're doing the professional and all is to make sure that there is that clear understanding that exist about exactly what is going to be done. That is part of not only the review process but this meeting and the rest of it is to make sure that there is a clear understanding and clear documentation so there is no doubt exactly as to what is to be done. The challenge that we have the applicant essentially without the approvals went and had performed some work and there was a stop work order issued. They came before us and explained the situation. We felt that there was serenity there and excepted their apology for doing what they've done. The purpose of this application right now the amended site plan is to do the best that we can and correct the items that were done that we can't do anything about other than to restore it to the best of our ability and to make the required improvements to make the property work. That is really the challenge that is before us is collectively as a board most of that reviewed and have that clear understanding with the applicant so that in turn that is done.

Mr. Seifert: I know when you give somebody lead way and move forward in good faith and then when something like this happens. Sometimes you step back and say well unfortunately because you did this, now you have to do this; and I think that is only right. Because we did go out in good faith and I did come here two years ago and said yes, let's do this and I do want to support these folks. And I feel like we did not get a whole lot back from that except for a whole lot more trouble. Instead of less trouble we got more trouble and now I'm concerned. I am not happy to be taken advantage of.

Mr. Hagarty: That's understood.

Mr. Seifert: Is it possible to get a copy of the site plan once it is revised?

Mr. Dougherty: We'll go through a process where the applicants will submit a revised set of plans. We'll send it on back if it is not up to snuff and return it. Then we will get what we call a compliance set of plans which will be signed. Which I am sure that we will have multiple copies to submit to the Borough so there will be a copy available at least to view and maybe get an extra copy made up.

Mr. Seifert: Yes, I would like to get a copy.

Mr. Dougherty: So, there will be a compliance set of plans indicating that it is the final version.

Mr. Hagarty: Thank you.

Mr. Gravlin: I understand exactly what Mr. Seifert is saying. He actually was at one of our meetings one day and I understand his concerns. In no particular order the turnaround issue I think that what we are

proposing is a natural turn around when no one is in the parking lot of course. Friday afternoon is their big day. I have done other mosque I did the one in Voorhees no one is out there all week long except for a few vehicles. Friday comes along there are cars everywhere. So with the exception of Friday I would expect this parking lot to be completely empty and it serves as a perfect turnaround to simply come in the parking lot way right to the parking stalls that are not occupied and right back out. And if the vehicles were not aware that it is a dead-end street; I don't know how often it occurs; certainly, with the present condition with that silt fence there is no way to turnaround. I would hope that they're not using Mr. Seifert's driveway to turnaround perhaps they are, but I think this lends itself to a turnaround area.

Ms. Kinback: I just want to add on the parking. This is covered in the minor site plans and we are providing more parking onsite than is required. And it was also additional prior approvals that if the congregation grows and there is additional parking demands that we will have to provide more.

Mr. Gravin: Ok, the capacity of the inlet. I understand exactly what Mr. Seifert's saying when asking for a double inlet. A double inlet which is what we will be putting in now is able to handle roughly about eight to ten CFS. A 100-year storm is less than 1 CFS so there is more than adequate capacity in the inlets that we will be putting in. Mr. Dougherty also asked that I put the curb perpendicular along the road so that the curb will also prevent water from running down. Now I understand that there is a concern by Mr. Seifert that we not-block his driveway. Perhaps we will oppress that curb at the top end so there will be provisions to assure that all of this runoff ends up in that inlet and in that piping system around Mr. Seifert's property. Topsoil I have several notes on this plan and it is a soil conservation requirement that there must be topsoil placed in all vegetated areas. If there is not enough existing topsoil, they will have to grate it in. That is enforced by soil conservation, but it will also be enforced by Remington and Vernick who will be out there doing the inspections on it. Just saying that there will be topsoil. These trees in the back will be planted they are included in the planning stages and will grow to be 80' tall in a year and a half. They will be planted or Remington and Vernick will not sign off for the final construction. I know Remington and Vernick will check every plant that goes in to make sure that it does agree with the plans that are on the landscaping schedule. We did take down that retaining wall and it is my intention to regrade that site. There was no need for that retaining wall. Perhaps the nice flat area we can slope that down and eliminate the need for a retaining wall. The retaining wall was in bad shape. The silt fence that was not installed properly I agree with you. There is a detail on the plan that clearly indicates that you have to tuck a lot of that fence in so that the soil matter isn't able to get underneath that. I will be speaking to the contractor about that. He has to get that corrected otherwise the silt fence isn't really do anything.

Mr. Seifert: There is not a particular run off down the road. My concern is with that swale if you leave that in there is no chance of that to run down so if that swale is able to be removed that would be great.

Mr. Gravin: There is no need for that swale any longer.

Mr. Seifert: I would like to receive a set of the plans.

Mr. Gravlin: I will be glad to email you the final plans once I get a letter back. The last thing is there was a tree that was overhanging the roof of the building. It was actually creating an issue with the roof. That was the reason that they took it down. I was not aware that they had taken it down but that was the reason. I believe it was a big maple tree and I will add a tree at that exact location or alongside of it so it does not affect the roof. Is there any other thing that needs to be addressed?

Mr. Seifert: My concern is about the design of the parking lot.

Mr. Gravlin: The parking lot I initially wanted to keep it pretty much the way that it was with the perpendicular parking. But then it isn't easily controlled because you have to have an unregulated edge paving and it is better thru a concrete apron because it is recognizable as to where the traffic should go. I believe it doesn't meet standards for parking signs and whatnot. This will not be our primary parking lot by any means. That is why I was thinking more of to redo the old playground area. That is where we will be parking. Is there anything else?

Mr. Hagarty: Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Gravlin on that? Are there any other members of the public that wish to come forward and speak on behalf of Application 2021-1?

Mayor Green: Motion to close the floor to the public

Mr. Hagarty: all in favor?

All "aye" Motion carried

Mr. Hagarty: The floor is closed to the public

Ms. Kinback: If I could just end with all of the testimony presented today, were agreeing to all of the conditions from today set forth from all the letters. Really what we need is to get back to work that will remedy the complaints of the neighbor and will stabilize everything.

Mr. Hagarty: Thank you.

Mayor Green: One other issue out there in dealing with the contractor and he was not working off the same set of plans that were approved by the board. So, part of this problem is with the contractor and the zoning inspector. He did not have plans and he was just kind of doing what he wanted. I do not know if there was a breakdown of communication with your client, the engineer or the contractor or something I do not know how it was working but the contractor was just doing what he wanted without plans.

Ms. Kinback: Ok we will keep the communication open and make sure that he has updated plans.

Mayor Green: So, before we lift the stop work order that is my question. Hopefully when we lift the stop work order, we will be working with the plans that are finalized.

Mr. Hagarty: Who is the contractor?

Mr. Gravlín: There is a company called Affordable Paving out in the Voorhees local office. I agree with the Mayor there was absolutely miscommunications. Last week when I emailed the contractor this set of plans for two reasons to make sure that he was aware of what we were going to be doing and also so he could reprice this thing. Obviously, there is a lot of additional cost on this now. I will make sure that he has the correct plans. I think he learned his lesson here not to do things that are not on the plans. It has really created a very big mess for everyone. We want to just put it behind us, and I believe that the congregation will show Pine Hill how they really are and get this project completed. He assures me that he will maintain this property. The object is to get them into this building. They will be the responsible party which he is required to as the property owner of the Borough.

Mayor Green: So, Hugh in your opinion is it ok to lift the stop work order at this time?

Mr. Dougherty: The perfected plan would really be the only guarantee. So, the compliance set of plans with the revisions that we talked about tonight. Get them back to me and we would sign off on those plans and at that point the bond would have to be posted. Was the bond posted to the original work?

Mr. Gravlín: I do not believe there was anything there because I was never asked to do an estimate.

Mayor Green: I can guarantee you we will not lift the stop work order without a bond posted.

Mr. Dougherty: So that would be the procedure generally.

Mayor Green: There is no bond posted and when I was speaking to this contractor, he did not know what we were talking about.

Mr. Gravlín: It is a limited bond now of days. The drainage system is a key critical public infrastructure.

Mayor Green: That was part of the problem, no bond and there were no plans actually on file at the Borough and he was out there doing all kinds of work and then he did work that wasn't even supposed to be done.

Mr. Gravlín: Instead of doing the proper work he did other work and I agree with you Mayor.

Mr. Hagarty: Based on the comments and testimony by Mr. Seifert obviously and the experiences to date I agree with the Mayor and our professional Mr. Dougherty that we started this process and didn't start too well. I don't think we have a choice in this matter but to make sure that we have a final set of approved plans before we can go on and lift the stop work order. I think that it is the only way given a lot of these matters and I understand the sincerity on your part of address and the items in Mr. Dougherty's letter and based on a lot of the testimony that has happened. But it gives us a sense of comfort that all that understanding is translating to a set of drawings that we make sure that everybody is on the same page. I think that this is really the proper way to deal with this thing.

Mr. Gravlin: How would we handle the performance bond?

Mayor Green: You would have to put it up but until we have a bond and the set of plans, we are not going to lift the stop work order.

Mr. Hagarty: I would think you need a set of plans to get final pricing from the contractor to make sure that there is a clear understanding of what they're doing and more importantly what they're not doing. Then that in turn will well make sure that were on the same page with that set of plans and then in turn the contractor can follow all of the requisite requirements in the litany of things that we have talked about from details with silt fencing or anything else. I am sure they understand but obviously it gives us the control mechanism to make sure what actually gets done in the field is what everybody wants to get done in the field. Any other questions or comments that the board has?

Contingent on a number of items I will try to spell out as much as can anyway and feel free as anyone can jump in. Contingent on submitted an amended site plan that addresses the items in Mr. Dougherty's letter the review comments and all of the various things from calculations and the light, addresses some of the items that we talked about tonight with respect to the testimony that has been provided in terms of rectifying some existing conditions all falling under that. Not only in terms of trees, grading and the light. And having an agreement in place with the Borough that the pipe and the outfall are maintained so that the Borough and the applicant can enter into that agreement that it is full responsibility of the applicant to maintain the pipe and the outfall that is going to be on Borough property which an easement will be provided.

Ms. Kinkack: Yes, we will maintain the outfall and piping.

Mr. Hagarty: I think that summarizes the main groups.

Mr. Hagarty: One of the things that is particularly important to me is that the work gets done with the Camden County Revision Engineers.

Mr. Hagarty: It is all part of the letter from the Camden County Conservation District that all of the requisites get done. I think that kind of captures the buckets of what we have talked about contingent upon your acceptance of those conditions.

Mr. Hagarty: I will entertain a motion to approve the amended site plan

Motion seconded by **Mr. Waddington**

Roll Call all "aye" Motion carried

Open Floor to the Public: **Mr. Hagarty:** Seeing that there is no other applications before us. I will entertain a motion to open the floor to the public.

Motion seconded by **Mayor Green**

Roll call all "aye" Motion carried

Close Floor to the Public: Seeing no public present, motion to close to the public.

Motion seconded by **Mr. Hagy**

Roll call all "aye" Motion carried

Mr. Hagarty: Is there any old business that anyone wishes to discuss? Seeing none is there any new business? I will just mention that our next meeting is planned for a in person meeting March 11th at 7:30pm. I believe we intend to have an application as far as we know.

Mayor Green: It will be regarding a use variance for 113 Cross Keys Road which is a landscape company.

Mr. Hagarty: Any other new business? I know that I went out of order in terms to open the meeting to the public but since we have done that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Motion to Adjourn: **Councilman Robb:** Motion to adjourn; seconded by **Mayor Green**
All "aye" motion carried.